



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*md*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,228	06/25/2001	Jeffrey H. Alger	03797.00013	3296

7590 05/04/2007  
Pamela I. Banner  
Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER
----------

CHEA, PHILIP J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/04/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/892,228	Applicant(s) ALGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Philip J. Chea	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 10-14 and 25-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 10-14, 25-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2153

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed March 8, 2007. Claims 6-8,10-14,25-33 are currently pending of which claims 25-33 are new. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos et al. (US 6,029,141), herein referred to as Bezos further in view of Chang et al. (US 6,324,552), herein referred to as Chang.

As per claim 6, Bezos discloses a client portal for facilitating the purchase of a particular product, comprising:

a browser capable of retrieving content through sites that are related to providing the particular product (see column 6 line 59 – column 7, line 5, where sites are provided that are related to various products).

Although the system disclosed by Bezos shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that a user cannot configure the client portal to add or modify controls of the client portal to access content through sites in the network that are not preselected sites and are not related to providing particular product, and wherein at least one of the preselected sites lists sites that are available for preselection.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bezos, as evidenced by Chang.

Art Unit: 2153

In an analogous art, Chang discloses that a user cannot configure the client portal to add or modify controls of the client portal to access content through sites in the network that are not preselected sites and are not related, and wherein at least one of the preselected sites lists sites that are available for preselection (see column 3, lines 40-51 and column 4, lines 36-41, where users cannot configure the browser to access sites not predetermined, and preselected sites are available to a certain depth of the root page, where a teach can set the depth limit to 0 in order to prevent the students from accessing any page other than their project pages or to a suitable depth where they know the hot links relate to the project).

Given the teaching of Chang, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bezos by employing a restricted browser, such as disclosed by Chang, in order to provide visitors using the client portal with product pages associated with supported sponsors or vendors.

As per claim 7, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose including a memory for storing the preselected sites (see Chang column 3, lines 25-31).

As per claim 8, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose at least one of the preselected sites list other preselected sites (see Bezos column 15, lines 28-36, and Fig. 9 = preselected sites and Fig. 10a = other preselected sites).

As per claim 10, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose a portal wherein the browser provides a header identifying characteristics of the browser (see Bezos column 8, lines 17-22). A cookie is considered the header that identifies the characteristics of the browser.

As per claim 11, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose a catalog of items for purchase, which are also from multiple content sources (see Bezos column 7, lines 6-11).

As per claim 12, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose the portal including a memory, and the catalog downloaded into the memory (see Bezos column 6, lines 59-67).

As per claim 13, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose that the catalog contains content from multiple content sources (see Bezos column 7, lines 6-11).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 14, Bezos in view of Chang further disclose identifying a user of the client portal; and the catalog contains a selection of items for purchase based upon a previous purchase history of the user (see Bezos column 9, lines 9-20, where user = Italian chef, and selection of items = favorite cookbooks). Also see 103 rejection below.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Chang and further in view of Shafer et al. ("Recommender Systems in E-Commerce" 1999).

Bezos in view of Chang shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above). In further support identifying a user of the client portal and having a catalog that contains a selection of items for purchase based upon a previous purchase history of the user are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bezos in view of Chang, as evidenced by Shafer et al.

In an analogous art, Shafer et al. disclose an e-commerce system where there is a means of presenting catalog information based upon a previous purchase history of the user (page 158, column 2, second paragraph).

Given the teaching of Schafer et al., a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bezos in view of Chang by employing a product recommendation based on a users previous purchase history, such as disclosed by Shafer et al., in order to help an e-commerce site adapt itself to each customer enabling individual personalization (Schafer et al., column 2, second paragraph).

4. Claims 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chang et al. (US 6,324,552), herein referred to as Chang.

As per claims 25,30, Chang discloses a first computer configured to receive first information via a network identifying a plurality of preselected sites (see column 3, lines 40-51, where project URLs are preselected sites),

Art Unit: 2153

wherein the first computer includes a browser configured to limit user access to the preselected sites (see column 3, lines 40-51, where a depth parameter that allows users to view unlisted sites may be set to 0 in order to limit the user to only the URLs specified in the project files).

As per claim 26, Chang further discloses a second computer, coupled to the first computer via the network, the second computer configured to identify the plurality of preselected sites and transmit the first information identifying the preselected sites to the first computer (see column 3, lines 25-31, where the second computer is the Project Repository).

As per claims 27,31, Chang further discloses that the network is the Internet (see column 3, lines 4-8).

As per claims 28,32, Chang further discloses that the first computer is configured to send second information to the second computer identifying a user preference, and wherein the second computer is configured to choose the preselected sites based on the user preference (see column 4, lines 36-41).

As per claims 29,33, Chang further discloses that the first computer is configured to control a format of the preselected sites as displayed by the browser, thereby providing consistent formatting among the sites (see column 3, lines 58-67).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed March 8, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant contends that Chang does not show a browser capable of retrieving content only through preselected sites.

In considering (A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although Chang does show that a depth parameter may be associated with a project URL to allow a user to browse unlisted sites. It is possible that the depth parameter can be set to 0 in order to limit the user to only browse the project sites that are listed (see column 2, lines 1-6) or to a certain depth where the teacher knows the hot linked sites are important to the project.

Art Unit: 2153

**Conclusion**

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Philip J Chea  
Examiner

  
GLENDA B. BURGESS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Art Unit: 2153

Art Unit 2153

PJC 4/19/07